

REMARKS

This amendment is in response to the Office Action of May 19, 2003 and is being filed with an RCE application.

A proposed change to Figure 3 is shown in red herein. It is respectfully submitted that this change is supported by page 15, line 13 of the specification. It is respectfully submitted that no new matter is added.

The Office action rejected Claims 16, 18 and 20-22 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by the Samuels reference. Similarly, the Office Action rejected Claims 17, 19 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over the Samuels reference in combination with the Garr reference; rejected Claims 13 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over the combination of the Samuels and Awa references; rejected Claim 15 as obvious over the combination of the Samuels and Garr references; rejected Claims 1, 3 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over the combination of the Samuels and Yano and/or Owa references; rejected Claims 2, 4, 5 and 7-10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over the Samuels, Yano and/or Owa references in combination with the Garr reference; and rejected Claims 11-12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over the Samuels, Yano and/or Owa, in combination with the Brown, Jr. reference.

In response to these prior art rejections, Claim 1 has been amended to further recite:

data-transmitting means for transmitting the print data to the printer only if the determining means has determined that the remaining ink amount is sufficient to complete the print operations based on the print data, wherein the printer performs the print operations based on the print data transmitted from the data-transmitting means

Similar amendments have been made to Claims 13, 14 and 16.

Early examination and allowance are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Gerald Levy  
Registration No. 24,419

Ronald E. Brown  
Registration No. 32,200

Pitney, Hardin, Kipp & Szuch, L.L.P.  
685 Third Avenue  
New York, New York 10017  
212-297-5800



FIG. 3

